

Application No.: 09/704,322

7

Docket No.: 03188/100H005-US1

REMARKS

In the Final Rejection of October 20, 2003, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. There is no prior art rejection.

The Examiner takes the position that the limitation of claim 1 (line 7) from which all other claims depend:

"establishing in a computer database a list of services available for the property"

is not supported in the Specification as originally filed.

The Examiner's position is that the database disclosed in the application as filed was a "database of the property for which the service was performed". [emphasis added]

Record of Interview

Applicants' attorney, Gordon D. Coplein, respectfully thanks the Examiner for his courtesy during a telephone interview on February 10, 2004. During the interview, the operation of method of the application was discussed.

Applicants' attorney referred to various parts of the Specification, discussed below, which were considered to support the limitations in question. Also discussed was a proposed amendment to claim 1, which would perhaps better define the clause of claim 1 in question. Thus, claim 1 is proposed to be amended to adopt the new language in the third step of "establishing in a computer database at least one vendor entity for the property and the service performed by a said at least one vendor entity".

In making the amendment, it was noted in claim 1 that the fifth step of "setting in a computer database . . . for the property" was now somewhat redundant and/or added confusion, and the clause is therefore proposed to be deleted. A similar amendment is proposed to claim 3 to make it consistent with amended claim 1. Editorial amendments are also proposed to several of the other claims to clarify the language. It is noted that claim 26 refers to a feature that corresponds to the clause of claim 1 to which the objection was made.

{W:\03188\100H005US1\00133747.DOC {XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX}}

Application No.: 09/704,322

8

Docket No.: 03188/100H005-US1

Applicants' attorney refers to the following portion of the Specification which provides support for both the original and the amended claim language.

In the application, the database is for management of one or more real estate properties, i.e., buildings. Each property is owned by an owner and can be managed by the owner or a property manager. Each property has one or more tenants. A tenant rents a space in the property.

The building requires services, e.g., fix the plumbing, change a lightbulb, wax the floors, etc. The services are performed by "vendors". For the space rented by the tenant and the building managed by the owner or property manager, there is a list of such vendors in the database associated with the property. The tenant, owner and/or property manager accesses the database and selects the vendor to perform one or more services as needed.

The following parts of the Specification provide additional explanation of this novel method.

Abstract. A property is entered in the database. Each property has "attributes" listed which include the vendors of services as described above.

Line 5 - The database contains data as to each of one or more vendor entities that are to provide services to the property.

Line 9 - A user profile is set for each vendor entity (related to the property).

Lines 12-14 - There is communication between the users of the entities, vendors, property owners, tenants, associated with the property.

Specification Support. The services available for a property as well as the processes for tenants to request these services are part of the lease parameters of the property. As such, they are part of the database.

Pages 27-30 of the Specification give a list of various types of service requests and how such requests are made. This part of the Specification also mentions in several occasions the software ability to control accessing, viewing and authorizing service requests.

{W:\03188\100H005US1\00133747.DOC [REDACTED]}

FEB-12-2004 13:58 FROM: GORDON COBLEIN
02/12/2004 13:58 FAX 527-7700

770 393 2616

TO: RightFax

P.002/005

Application No.: 09/704,322

9

Docket No.: 03188/100H005-US1

Page 30, lines 5-8. "The user making the request selected a type of service from a list (generated from the database) similar to the above. A list of vendors that can perform the needed services is then displayed. The vendor is selected and the request is made and transmitted to the vendor. . . ."

It is respectfully requested that the amendment be entered since it clearly places the application in condition for allowance. There is no prior art rejection. No new matter is added and no new issue is raised. As shown above, this is basically a clarification of language.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Prompt and favorable action is requested.

Dated. February 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Gordon D. Coplein
Gordon D. Coplein

Registration No.: 19,165
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

{W:\03188\100H005US1\00133747.DOC [REDACTED]}